

REMARKS

I. Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-28 were pending in this application.

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 14-18, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kaminski U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0199185 (hereinafter "Kaminski").

Claims 22, 24, 25, 27, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ellis U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0174430 (hereinafter "Ellis").

Claims 5, 12, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Kaminski in view of Ellis.

Claims 6, 13, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Kaminski in view of Knee U.S. Patent No. 5,589,892 (hereinafter "Knee").

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Ellis in view of Knee.

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Ellis in view of Boyle U.S. Patent No. 7,027,716.

II. Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants have canceled claims 1-28 without prejudice and added new claims 29-52. No new matter has been added by the new claims, and the new claims are fully supported by the originally filed application. See, for example, applicant's specification at ¶ 121-132 and FIGS. 22-25.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the new claims in light of the remarks that follow.

III. Applicants' Reply

Applicants' independent claims 29 and 41 are directed to a method and apparatus for resolving conflicts for series recordings. A user indication is received to schedule the shows of a plurality of series for recording. Each series is assigned a recording priority. A conflict between the scheduled recordings for a first show in a first series and a second show is determined. The scheduled recording of the first show is canceled based on the recording priority assigned to the first series. A first interface screen is displayed that includes listings of programs that are scheduled for recording. In the first interface screen, an indication that the scheduled recording of the first show has been canceled is displayed. A user selection is received, from a single keystroke by the user, to switch from the first interface screen to a second user interface screen. The second user interface screen indicates the recording priorities assigned to the plurality of series. A user request is then received to increase the recording priority for the first series such that the scheduled recording of the first show is no longer canceled.

Thus, applicants' independent claims 29 and 41 provide a novel and inventive approach for easily and conveniently resolving conflicts for series programming. From an indication displayed in a first interface screen, such as a

"no record icon" in applicants' FIG. 23, a user can identify that a scheduled recording for a particular show conflicts with the scheduled recording of another show and will not be recorded. The user may prevent the scheduled recording for the particular show from being canceled by switching to a second interface screen (e.g., applicants' FIGS. 24 and 25) using a single keystroke and changing the recording priority of the corresponding series.

The Examiner rejected previously pending claims 22, 24, 25, 27, and 28 as being anticipated by Ellis, which refers to an electronic program guide with personal video recording (PVR) features. Applicants respectfully submit that Ellis does not show or suggest applicants' above-described novel and inventive approach for easily and conveniently resolving conflicts for series programming.

Applicants note that Ellis' FIG. 7 and the corresponding text refer to a search display screen with icons displayed for programs scheduled to be recorded that may not be recorded due to a conflict. Applicants also note that Ellis' FIG. 52 and the corresponding text refer to a delete/recording priority display screen for series recordings. Despite the disclosure of these sections, and as acknowledged by the Examiner on page 11 of the Office Action, Ellis does not disclose switching, using a single keystroke, from a first interface screen showing scheduled recordings to a second interface screen showing, and enabling the user to change, recording priorities. Applicants' claimed invention therefore patentably improves on Ellis by reciting receiving, through a

single keystroke by a user, a user selection to switch from the first interface screen (including listings for programs scheduled to be recorded) to a second interface screen (indicating the recording priorities assigned to the plurality of series).

In an attempt to make up for the deficiency in Ellis, the Examiner refers to the favorite channel list screens described in col. 30, ll. 50-67 of Knee (Office Action, page 11). This section of Knee, however, merely refers to the selection of a particular favorite channels list when multiple favorite channels for multiple users are used. While each list may be accessed by pressing an associated favorite channel key, these keys are used to provide personalized information of the same type (e.g., a favorite channels list) to each user. Knee does not show or suggest using these keys for navigation between screens displaying different types of information, let alone between a first interface screen with listings for programs scheduled to be recorded and a second interface screen indicating recording priorities assigned to a plurality of series, as specified by applicants' claims 29 and 41. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that Ellis and Knee, taken alone or in combination, fail to show or suggest this feature of applicants' claimed invention. Therefore, independent claims 29 and 41, as well as dependent claims 30-40 and 42-52, which depend therefrom, are allowable over Ellis and Knee.

Finally, the Examiner rejected applicants' previously pending claims 1-4, 7-11, 14-18, and 21 as being anticipated by

Kaminski. Applicants respectfully submit that Kaminski does not show or suggest all of the elements of applicants' independent claims 29 and 41. In particular, Kaminski does not show or suggest at least applicants' claim element of receiving, through a single keystroke by a user, a user selection to switch from the first interface screen (including listings for programs scheduled to be recorded) to a second interface screen (indicating the recording priorities assigned to the plurality of series). Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claims 29 and 41, as well as dependent claims 30-40 and 42-52, which depend therefrom, are allowable over Kaminiski.

IV. Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth above, applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration in light of the foregoing remarks and a favorable action are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Maxine Lee/

Maxine Lee
Reg. No. 61,495
Agent for Applicants
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 75563